

Thanikkudam Scheme.

166. Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.—Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(a) whether the Chief Engineer has submitted the final report (on the Thanikkudam Scheme) mentioned in answer to sub-division (e) to question No. 459 of the Legislative Session, 1106;

(b) if not what is the delay due to;

(c) if the report is submitted will the Government be pleased to make it available to the House;

(d) is the report in favour of the Scheme or against it?

Mr. V. K. Aravindaksha Menon.—(a) No.

(b) The Assistant Engineer's final report is being scrutinised by the Chief Engineer on various aspects.

(c) No answer is necessary in view of answer to sub-division (a).

(d) Do.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.—When can we expect the report?

Mr. V. K. Aravindaksha Menon.—Sir, the Thanikkudam scheme has been devised to help the kole cultivation. I had occasion to state in this House many times that the possibilities of the Chalakkudi Diversion scheme ought to be given proper consideration before the Thanikkudam scheme is taken up. And since the question of the Chalakkudi Diversion is being taken up with the Travancore Durbar, it was thought a settlement of that question is a necessary preliminary to the taking and completion of the Thanikkudam scheme. So we are waiting for the decision one way or the other, of the Chalakkudi Diversion scheme. Till then we have submitted reports for the proper cultivation of Kole lands by other means. Till that question is decided upon, I do not think there is any necessity to complete the Thanikkudam scheme.

167. Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.—Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(a) what is the amount spent up-to-date upon (1) the Thanikkudam Scheme (2) the Chalakkudi Diversion Scheme;

(b) does the Government propose to do any substantial help to the large number of cultivators of kole lands?

Mr. V. K. Aravindaksha Menon.—(a) (1) and (2). It is not possible to furnish correct information as no separate accounts have been maintained for these schemes.

(b) The Chief Engineer's proposals in the matter are being considered by the Government.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.—How long was it before the consideration of the Government?

Mr. V. K. Aravindaksha Menon.—Not more than 30 days—about one month.

Bills pending for pre-audit in the Comptroller of Accounts' Office.

168. Mr. K. Ayyappan.—Will the Government be pleased to inform the House:—

(1) the number of bills that had been pending for pre-audit in the Comptroller's Office till the 30th Mithunam 1106;

(2) the number separately of such of those bills as had been delayed more than two weeks, one month, two months, three months and four months;

(3) the longest delay caused in the pre-audit of these bills?

Mr. K. Krishna Pisharodi.—(1) 584.

(2) More than two weeks 405

Do. one month 91

Do. two months 40

Do. three „ 15

Do. four „ 33*

* (These are pending for want of allotment).

(3) Seven months and 3 days.

(This is due to want of allotment.)

Mr. K. Ayyappan.—May I know whether the delay is due to want of hands in the office?

Mr. K. Krishna Pisharodi.—This unprecedented flow of pre-audit bills was not expected. It was due to the revision being given effect to with retrospective effect that there is such a flow. That was why there was so much delay and in 1106 up to the end of Mithunam, we have received 4,389 bills of which 4,000 have been disposed off. Owing to the revision of the Education department being given effect to only recently, we have received a lot of bills. Even after the first of Karkadagam we have received 961 bills up to the 25th. So we have suspended the local audit work and asked the local audit staff to work here to complete this.

Mr. K. Ayyappan.—My question is whether you require more men hereafter.

Mr. K. Krishna Pisharodi.—These arrear bills will not be a recurring feature. So there would be no necessity for additional hands for pre-auditing bills. But we have applied for additional hands for other sections.